

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
7 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

8 HOCK GOH,

9 Plaintiff,

10 v.

11 CROSS RECRUITING INC.,

12 Defendant.

CASE NO. C20-172 RSM

ORDER DENYING STIPULATED  
PROTECTIVE ORDER

13  
14 This matter is before the Court on the parties' Stipulated Protective Order. Dkt. #8. The  
15 protective order purports to protect "testimony, information, documents, and tangible things  
16 produced or otherwise exchanged (including both materials exchanged as part of the formal  
17 discovery process, as well as information produced or exchanged by the parties informally in  
18 furtherance of settlement discussions or negotiations[)]." *Id.* at 2.

19 Under this Court's local civil rules, protective orders are not "to confer blanket protection  
20 on all disclosures or responses to discovery." LCR 26(c)(2). Rather, the protective order must  
21 be limited to "information or items that are entitled to confidential treatment under the applicable  
22 legal principles" and must "adequately and specifically describe[] the justification," where  
23 necessary. *Id.*

1           The Court finds the parties' designations to be overbroad in the absence of further  
2 justification. The Court accordingly finds and ORDERS that the Stipulated Protective Order  
3 (Dkt. #8) is DENIED. The Court's denial is without prejudice to the parties refiling a stipulated  
4 protective order consistent with the above rules or with adequate justification for the broad  
5 protections the parties seek.

6           Dated this 10 day of March, 2020.

7  
8 

9           RICARDO S. MARTINEZ  
10          CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24